

### REMARKS

Independent claims 1 and 22 have been amended to emphasize the removability of the carrier sheet from the top surface of the facestock.

### INTERVIEW SUMMARY

At the interview conducted on May 23, 2007, the following topics were discussed:

#### 1. Inherency Rejection

The examiner had based the inherency rejection in part on the observation that in each of the cited Begelfer et al., Smith and Dollinger references:

“it is inherent that the multilayer composite distorts more than 1.0% in either the machine or cross machine direction when in an unrestrained state and exposed to temperatures above about 140°F and when subjected to tension greater than about 0.5 PLI”

It was pointed out that this is directly opposite to what is claimed in independent claims 1 and 22, namely, that the stiffness and tensile strength of the carrier sheet is sufficient to prevent the facestock from distorting more than 1.0% under these temperature and tension conditions. The examiner took note of this and agreed to reconsider the inherency rejection based on the above quoted language.

#### 2. Product Samples

One of the applicants, Philip R. Emery, showed the examiner a sample of the claimed multilayer composite, and photographs and a sample of the composite's facestock adhesively applied to a substrate.

#### 3. The Cited Prior Art

Each of the cited references was discussed. It was pointed out that in Begelfer et al., the objective is to provide a pressure sensitive label that is dimensionally stable in high

temperature application and processing environments of up to 800° Fahrenheit. To accomplish this, Mr. Emery confirmed that the cover sheet 42 in Begelfer et al. would necessarily be permanently adhered to the dimensionally unstable facestock 14, and that consequently the bond strength of the adhesive 44 would exceed the yield strength of the facestock.

Mr. Emery then went on to explain that in a self wound composite of the type described in Smith, (a typical example being a shelf liner), the dimensionally stable film component 10 is permanently adhered to the dimensionally unstable film component 22, thus allowing the resulting dimensionally stable composite to be unrolled in wide widths, adhesively applied to substrates, and if necessary, removed and repositioned in order to correct misalignment or to remove wrinkles or bubbles, all without stretching or otherwise adversely affecting the composite (Col. 12, lines 58-67). Here again, according to Mr. Emery, such permanent adhesion would result in a bond strength that exceeds the yield strength of the unstable film component.

In Dollinger, labels are described for application to deformable substrates. Mr. Emery pointed out that in such applications, the facestocks 12 are permanently bonded to the supporting layers 14, again resulting in a bond strength at the interface between the two that exceeds the yield strength of the facestocks. Were the situation otherwise, when the substrates (e.g. squeeze bottles) are deformed, the facestocks 12 would have a tendency to separate from the supporting layers 14, and thus would wrinkle and become unsightly. Permanent bonding between the layers 12, 14 is additionally evident from the Dollinger disclosure at col. 5, lines 14-17 which identifies melt coextrusion as the preferred method of bonding the two layers together.

At the conclusion of the interview, the examiner acknowledged the foregoing, and indicated that an additional investigation would be undertaken.

4. In Summary

Each of the applicants' independent claims 1 and 22 specifies that the carrier sheet is removably laminated to the top surface of the dimensionally unstable facestock, with the bond strength at the interface therebetween being less than the yield strength of the facestock, thereby allowing separation of the carrier sheet without distorting or otherwise damaging the facestock.

For the reasons explained during the interview and summarized above, none of the cited references discloses or suggests this concept. Accordingly, absent the discovery of new and more pertinent prior art, it is now believed that this application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Maurice E. Gauthier  
Registration No. 20,798  
Gauthier & Connors LLP  
225 Franklin Street, Suite 2300  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110  
Telephone: (617) 426-9180, ext: 113